

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were examined. All claims were rejected. In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants amend claims 1, 8, 10 and 13, but do not cancel any claims or add any new claims. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the aforementioned amendments and the following remarks is requested.

I. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 8, 10 and 13 for various informalities therein. Applicants have amended these claims to correct the alleged defects and request that these objections be withdrawn.

II. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 15-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,091,900 issued to Subramaniam *et al.* ("*Subramaniam*"). It is axiomatic that to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose every element of the claim. Applicants believe that *Subramaniam* fails to meet this requirement.

As to claim 8, that claim recites a method comprising a number of operations, including receiving requests from a client browser via a network, said requests dispatched by a Web page having a first frame and a second frame. The Examiner neglects to mention at least the Web page having a first frame and a second frame in his analysis, and Applicants have been unable to locate any teaching on that point in the cited portion or elsewhere in the reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that no *prima facie* case of anticipation has been established, and the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 8.

As to claim 9, that claim depends upon claim 8, and is patentable for at least the reason discussed in support of that base claim. Applicants request that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn as well.

As to claim 15, that claim recites a machine-readable medium that provides instructions to cause a processor to perform various operations, including receiving a request from a requesting frame of a client browser to load data object for a target frame and determining if the owner of the target frame is different from the owner providing the data object. Applicants note that *Subramaniam* does not mention frames at all, let

alone discuss determining whether the owner of a target frame is different from the owner providing a data object. For at least those reasons, Applicants believe that the reference fails to anticipate claim 15, and request that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to claims 16 and 17, those claims depend upon claim 15, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed in support of that claim. Applicants ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 16 and 17 also.

As to claim 18, that claim recites a machine-readable medium that provides instructions to cause an executing processor to perform various operations, including accessing a current URL used to locate HTML document currently loaded in one of multiple frames displayed by a web browser; building a new URL by concatenating https:// with the current URL; and dispatching a new request using the new URL to invoke Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure (HTTPS) communication between said one of multiple frames of the Web browser and a Web server. As previously discussed, *Subramaniam* does not contain any teachings regarding the interaction of a Web browser displaying multiple frames and a Web server. Thus, at least the elements mentioned above are not present in the reference, so it cannot anticipate claim 18. For at least those reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of this claim.

As to claims 19 and 21, those claims depend directly or indirectly upon claim 18, and are patentable for at least the reasons discussed in support of that base claim. Applicants ask that these rejections be withdrawn.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10-13 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Subramaniam* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,333 issued to Brendel ("*Brendel*").

As to claim 1, Applicants note that this claim recites several features of a system, including a Web page having a first frame and a second frame, and the handling of a request from a requesting frame to load data object for a target frame. *Subramaniam* does not contain any instruction on dealing with multiple frames in a Web system, and *Brendel* fails to supplement *Subramaniam* on this point. Thus, for at least the reason that the combined references fail to teach or suggest a plurality of servers executing a software code to generate a new uniform resource locator (URL) and return a redirect

message with the new URL to a client browser *in response to a request received from a requesting frame to load data object for a target frame*, Applicants submit that this rejection is improper and respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw it.

As to claims 2-7, 10-13 and 20, those claims depend directly or indirectly upon one of claims 1, 8 or 15, each of which has been discussed previously and shown to be patentable over the reference or references of record. For at least the reasons discussed in support of those base claims, Applicants ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these dependent claims as well.



CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 1-21, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Dated: 12/22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that the correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Lillian E. Rodriguez

12-22-04
December 22, 2004